

Copy

Dr. Ewald RUDOLF, lawyer, MUNICH 2, Arcostrasse 5/II
telephone 54374, post-office transfer account 56649

19 Oct 1954

MUNICH, October 19, 1954

Dr. R/Gr.-23/30

TO: The County-Court MUNICH I,

The Court for civil law cases

Civil Action

of the lawyer Dr. E. RUDOLF, MUNICH 2, Arcostrasse 5/II
on behalf of KORZHAN Elisabeth, née MOSKVA, wife at KEMPTEN, Kauf-
beurerstrasse 80, whose case is pleaded by the undersigned

-plaintiff-

against

KORZHAN Michael, employee in MUNICH 15, Herzog-Heinrichstrasse 38

-defendant-

concerning divorce

Having presented a proxy, a photo of the deposition of the
plaintiff made before the notary at HAMMELBURG as a substi-
tution for the lost certificate of marriage and finally a
police certificate on the German citizenship-I appoint my-
self her agent and bring in on behalf of her and against
the defendant

an action,

suggesting the taking into consideration the fact:

- I. The marriage of the opposing parties is divorced because
the marriage relation has been dissolved for more than
3 years.
- II. Both the parties give up all the claim to the costs of
the action.

Reason:

The opposing parties are German citizens; they got married
in church in LVOV on November 22, 1936 according to the law
which was in force there at that time,

They are former Polish, and now-German citizens. Their last common residence was SANOK in Poland.

Their marriage relation ceased to exist in 1944. No children have resulted from the marriage. The plaintiff had to escape in June 1944, namely-to VIENNA. The defendant had already worked in his profession in CRACOW for a long time before the escape. He visited his wife in VIENNA in the year 1944; however, he intimated to her already at that time that he was not going to re-establish neither the marriage community nor the domestic community.

P r o o f : The examination of the parties.

The opposing parties have not seen each other since that time. Later on the plaintiff returned to her mother country and was taken prisoner there. It was not until 1945 that she was released; she arrived in the Eastern Zone wherefrom she went to the Federal Republic in June 1954 with the purpose of emigration. The defendant has not cared for the plaintiff for the whole time. The divorce action is brought according to the § 48 of the marriage law, and not according to the § 43.

It is of great importance to the plaintiff to emigrate as soon as possible. She has come to an agreement with the defendant according to which he will pay the costs of maintenance till her emigration; the defendant wishes for the divorce, too.

Therefore please give up the attempt at reconciliation and fix an early time for the trial.

Stamp: The County-Court

Oct.29,1954

MUNICH I

....enclosures

Dr.E.RUDOLF

Lawyer

Attested copy

an illegible signature

Lawyer